

Appl. No. 10/709,027  
Amdt. dated January 26, 2006  
Reply to Office action of December 6, 2005

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

1. *Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-10, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US006746130B2 ("130").*

5   **Response:**

Claim 1 is amended to recite "the dispersion film being a diffuser" which is previously limited in claim 3. No new matter is introduced. Claim 1 is amended to overcome the above rejection, as the examiner has suggested that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore reconsideration of the amended claim 1 is politely requested.

15   Claims 5, 6, and 8-10 are dependent on claim 1 and should be allowed if the amended claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 5, 6, and 8-10 is politely requested.

20   Claim 17 is amended to recite "a light-guiding plate positioned between the light source and the dispersion film for guiding the light beams generated by the light source; a diffuser positioned between the light-guiding plate and the dispersion film for uniformly distributing the light beams; and a reflective plate positioned under the light-guiding plate for reflecting light beams into the liquid crystal display panel". Such limitation is previously recited in claim 20, therefore no new matter is introduced. Claim 17 is amended to overcome the above rejection, as the examiner has suggested that claim 20 would be allowable if rewritten in

Appl. No. 10/709,027  
Amdt. dated January 26, 2006  
Reply to Office action of December 6, 2005

independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Reconsideration of the amended claim 17 is politely requested.

5       Claim 18 is dependent on claim 17 and should be allowed if the amended claim 17 is allowed. Reconsideration of claim 18 is politely requested.

**2. Allowable Subject Matter**

10      *Claims 2-4, 7 and 19-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.*

15      *Claims 11-16 are allowed.*

**Response:**

20      Claim 3 is cancelled. Claims 2, 4, and 7 are dependent on claim 1 and should be allowed if the amended claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 2, 4, and 7 is therefore requested.

25      Claim 20 is cancelled. Claim 19 is dependent on claim 17 and should be allowed if the amended claim 17 is allowed. Reconsideration of claim 19 is therefore requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/709,027  
Amdt. dated January 26, 2006  
Reply to Office action of December 6, 2005

Sincerely yours,

5

Winston Hsu

Date: 01/26/2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

10 Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : [winstonhsu@naipo.com](mailto:winstonhsu@naipo.com)

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me.

(The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. =

15 10 PM in Taiwan.)